

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,860	08/12/2005	Thierry Bernard	930092-2009	4878
Ronald R Sant	7590 02/22/200 meci	EXAMINER		
Frommer Law	rence & Haug	KNOX, STEWART		
745 Fifth Aver New York, NY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3641	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2009	DADED

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/522,860	BERNARD, THIERRY	
Examiner	Art Unit	
STEWART T. KNOX	3641	

	STEWART T. KNOX	3641	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appendor for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extended from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, it checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	lianas with 27 CED 41 27 must be 6	Clad within two worth	a of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t         <ul> <li>(a)</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>(b)</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown to the policition in better that the proposed in the prop</li></ul></li></ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•	_
7. If or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) alloyed:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Michael J. Carone/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3640			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 13. Other: The amendments as filed appear mainly to recite parts of claim 2 into claim 1, describing how the cables connect to one another by penetrating into the inside of the other cable which is covered, in more detail, in claim 2. As such, the amendments do not appear to recite any substantially different material from that evaluated in the final rejection. While the Examiner agrees that Manual Tecnico does not disclose electrical connections and the arrangement of pins, it was never relied upon for that teaching. Reher, Holtzapple and the state of the art with regard to the use of electrical electroalcrost was relied upon for such a teaching. Applicant further notes several features which are not present in the claims, i.e. a second firing control cable and assembly without baring the electrical wires, which are not relevant to the present rejection.

Applicant further argues that the arrangement of Holtzapple does not show a cable that is "solid" with the tap wire. However, the Examiner's position has been and continues to be that the term "solid" is sufficiently broad as to include the arrangement of Holtzapple, absent any more specific definition in the specification or known in the art.

Applicant further argues that multiple conduction connectors would not be able to insulate between separate parts of a cable, however none of this is rected in the claims and is thus irrelevant. As it is claimed, the rectaint on force than one connection conductor merely amounts to duplication of the essential working parts. Finally, the use of pre-stripped wires is again irrelevant, since it is not claimed one way or the other.